DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 143 EA 004 647

TITLE	Community Parity in Federally Funded Programs. A Position Paper.
INSTITUTION	Recruitment Leadership and Training Inst., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
PUB DATE	Jun 72
NOTE	56p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Citizen Participation; *Community Control; Community Involvement; Community Role; Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; Models; *Planning; *School Community Relationship

ABSTRACT

This paper supports the contention that community parity is an essential condition for the successful implementation of all projects supported by the U.S. Office of Education. The paper begins with a summary of the reasoning underlying this position, followed by some recommendations designed to guide planners of future government programs in providing for effective community participation. A major portion of the paper, devoted to describing the contributions of some major analysts of community participation experiments, presents various models and their practical applications. A bibliography is appended for further study. (Author/JF)

COMMUNITY PARITY IN FEDERALLY FUNDED PROGRAMS

A Position Paper prepared by the Recruitment Leadership and Training Institute June, 1972

Recruitment Leadership
Training Institute
Ritter Hall No. 351
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pa. 19122

ED 070143

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEH REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Recruitment Leadership and Training Institute

(A national panel which provides technical and developmental assistance to projects funded, under P.L. 90-35, Part A, Section 504, and administered by the National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems, formerly the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development)

Bernard C. Watson
Director
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dorothy Innes Blanchard
Assistant Director
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Warren H. Bacon
Chicago, Illinois

Albert Holliday
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

James Kelley
Fort Collins, Colorado

Christine J. Moore
Baltimore, Maryland

Edward Moreno
San Fernando, California

John Naisbitt
Chicago, Illinois

Jean Sampson
Lewiston, Maine

Rodney Smith
Tallahassee, Florida

Ronald Tyrrell
Beachwood, Ohio

EA 004 647

Edward Wallerstein
New York, New York

Marian Warner
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dorothy Williams
Boston, Massachusetts

The report presented herein was prepared pursuant to a Grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

3

Design by Harold Pattek

Preface

The members of the Recruitment Leadership and Training Institute panel are unanimously agreed that community parity is an essential condition for the successful implementation of all projects supported by the U.S. Office of Education. This position, described in detail in the following pages, was taken after countless hours of discussion, exchange of personal and professional experiences in a variety of educational ventures, and an examination of much of the available literature on the topic. While this paper is not an exhaustive study of the complexities of community participation, the Recruitment LTI hopes that it will clearly indicate why community parity in educational planning and implementation is considered so vital.

The first part of the paper contains a summary of the reasoning underlying the LTI position. Specific recommendations are then offered to guide planners of future government programs in providing for effective community participation. A major portion of the paper describes the contributions of some major analysts of community participation experiments, and presents various models and their practical applications. An extensive bibliography is included for those who wish to engage in further study of the literature on this topic.

The Recruitment LTI wishes to acknowledge the assistance rendered by Hope Justus, whose research and writing contributed much to this paper.

Initiating a New Order of things is difficult, doubtful, and dangerous.

Machiavelli

I participate, you participate, he participates, we participate, you participate . . . They profit.

French student poster

If politics is the art of the possible, community participation may be the art of the impossible.

Government official

"Citizen participation" virtually defies generalization and delights in reducing abstractions to dust.

Spiegel and Mittenthal

5

Community Parity In Federally Funded Programs

The right of citizens to participate in the making of decisions which will affect their lives is a basic premise of democratic government. The New England town meeting, in which residents engaged in lively debate on matters of concern to the community, is enshrined in American history as an ideal model for the conduct of public business. But as the nation increased in size, and its population became more heterogeneous, the right of participation gradually diminished for most of the citizenry to voting on candidates and proposals. Only in those communities where most residents share a similar measure of affluence, power and education is the tradition of active discussion, leading to agreement on appropriate measures to be taken, maintained. For many other communities, however, particularly those populated by the poor, by minorities, or by the uneducated, the rights and responsibilities of citizenship are empty, meaningless concepts. People in these neighborhoods have historically been considered fair game for political machines, objects of charity for the local ladies bountiful, or cases to be dealt with by professional experts. The glowing rhetoric about government of the people, by the people and for the people has had, almost from the beginning, its hidden conditions: to be part of "the people" one could not be poor, foreign-born or non-white.

In recent years, however, this country has witnessed the stirrings of protest by those relegated to second-class citizenship. Had the political system or the charitable organizations or the professional agencies been able and will-

ing to perceive their clients as human beings of worth and to meet their needs in ways calculated to enhance their dignity and self-respect, social unrest might have been mitigated, if not avoided altogether. Instead, it has become evident that second-class citizenship, far from being a stepping stone to independence and full participation in the benefits of a free society, is more likely to be a permanent status, escape from which is reserved for the most ambitious few. Nowhere is this phenomenon—a self-perpetuating cycle of defeat and despair—more evident than in education. A child born in certain of our neighborhoods, and assigned to the local schools, is almost certainly doomed to functional illiteracy, low-level employment and poverty. To indicate that his opportunity is in any sense equal to that of the child born into a more favorable environment is an extreme form of hypocrisy.

And yet, protected by an aura of professional competence, a centralized bureaucracy, and its public protestations of concern for all children, the educational establishment has subtly or blatantly insisted that the burden of proof is on the child: if he fails, it is his own fault (or his parents') and not that of the schools. When challenged by the facts of unequal allocations of funds or personnel among various schools, the educational establishment has rarely or reluctantly responded with specific changes. More often, it has consistently ignored, opposed or undermined the efforts of many parents to obtain improvement in the schools.

Even in those cases where some attempt has been made to insure parent participation in school affairs, there is substantial evidence that educators are at best cautious and at worst hostile to "interference" from non-professionals. Where guidelines for community involvement have been prepared, they have been honored more in the breech than in the observance. The power to influence decisions has been so limited, so hemmed in by financial and contractual restrictions, that citizens have rightfully concluded that participation is an exercise in futility, if not an insult to their intelligence. The drive for community control has been a logical outcome of years of frustrating experience with "solutions" imposed from a central office which, at the local level, do little or nothing to solve the problems of poor education. An important contributing factor to this sense of frustration is the widespread feeling that many teachers care little about the children in their classes and have almost no expectation that they can learn. The combination of endless failure in the schools and community powerlessness has forced some parents into apathy and resignation, but there are many other parents among the poor and the minority groups of this nation who continue to struggle gallantly—although not always politely—for quality education for their youngsters.

It should be obvious that equalizing of educational opportunity is not simply a favor to be granted by the affluent of the society to the less-well-endowed: rather, it is an urgently needed investment in the future health and wel-

fare of the nation. And, as Henry Levin in his study for the Mondale Committee has pointed out,[1] it is an investment which, in the long run, is far less expensive than the alternative costs of lost income and taxes, or provision of welfare, and even costs in crime, all attributable to an inadequate education.

Community participation in educational affairs is not a guarantee that all the problems of the schools will be solved. It is, first of all, a basic right which should and must be granted to parents and to the larger community, regardless of how competent they are perceived to be by the official educational establishment. This is a right which is taken for granted in middle and upper class suburban communities, where those responsible for education—or indeed any other civic services—are required to act responsibly. "The essence of community control," Derrick Bell of Harvard has written, "is the sense of parents that they can and do influence policy-making in their children's schools in ways beneficial to their children. Parents in highly regarded suburban school communities have this sense, and in varying degrees, teachers and administrators in those schools convey an understanding that their job success depends on satisfying not the board or the union but the parents whose children are enrolled in the school." [2]

Of course, in those "highly regarded communities" the persons who wield influence in school affairs are also powerful people outside the school. But educators can no longer be

allowed to assume, as they usually have, that parents who are economically powerless have nothing worth saying about their children's schooling. Ironically, the struggle for quality education may be more compelling to the poor or minority parent because he sees in that the means for liberating his son or daughter from the bonds of economic and intellectual oppression which have kept him from a successful and fully satisfying life.

Community participation is also a means of removing the protective aura around professional educators which has too long served to insulate them from accountability to those they claim to serve. While the threat inherent in such exposure is almost universally feared by educators, there is great promise in the opening of new lines of communication and replacing the fear and misunderstanding on both sides with visible common commitment to effective education. Common sense, let alone research studies, indicates that the psychological well-being and the educational potential of children are enhanced when they understand that their parents and their teachers are working towards the same ends. To be satisfied with anything less than cordial relations and continuing dialogue between educators and parents is tantamount to depriving the child of the atmosphere of trust and confidence which is his basic need and right.

The United States Office of Education should, as a matter of principle (not merely pragmatic surrender to any single vocal group), become

the educational world's most unequivocal advocate for community participation in school affairs. Through every means at its disposal, but particularly by inclusion of community parity as a condition for every grant of funds, the U.S. Office of Education must seek to reinstate parents and community representatives as equal partners in the educational process. No general definition of the community, other than that it comprise those residing in the neighborhood of or being served by a specific institution, can be given, nor can any list of the particular issues to be tackled be prepared in advance. The definition of roles and responsibilities may be difficult and frustratingly time-consuming. Mistakes may be made, and tempers may flare. But it is clear that programs prepackaged and delivered by professionals are no longer acceptable: the community must have parity with educators in needs assessment, design, implementation, and evaluation of every Federally funded project. For the U.S. Office to compromise on this point, to cater to the fears and anxieties of those whose domain is challenged by input from new sources, is dereliction of its leadership role and, in the long run, assurance of disaster.

Recommendations

While the goal is parity, the recommendations concerning definition of community, selection of community participants, and provision for community roles are suggestive only. A specific national model is not viable, and none should be imposed. Guidelines should be set on the basis of identified strengths and weaknesses in programs that have been operative; the best available research from relevant academic disciplines; judgments of persons most knowledgeable about and experienced with community participation and control programs; and opinions and comments of community members themselves.

A beginning step might well be a representative sampling of members of each affected group (CAPTS, or Community, Administrators, Parents, Teachers, Students) in some Federally funded education programs in order to obtain their suggestions and their views of the problems encountered in community participation. Preliminary guidelines for inclusion of community members in the planning, implementation and evaluation of Federally funded projects could then be drawn up, tested and refined. They should be issued in final form only when their effectiveness has been assured over a period of time in various settings.

1. Parity in Participation

It is recommended that "participants" be geographically limited to the attendance areas of the local school(s), but include parents of all children in the school even if some children are bussed in or attend the school under transfer arrangements. All members of the CAPTS

groups should have guaranteed opportunities to participate, but their roles, percentage of members on the policy-making body, and the like, should "evolve" through the mechanisms described below, with the exception that parents should be guaranteed the opportunity to hold 50 percent membership on the formal community board and all CAPTS members should have the option to be represented. Representatives of the local teacher organization should be invited to send representatives to meetings also.

The initial selection method favored in the literature and by persons with experience is known as the gatekeeper approach: one or two visible indigenous leaders are selected (or hired) to recruit others.[3] They, in turn, reach out to less visible but interested persons, and so on in succeeding layers of "involvement" until the group is large enough to constitute what might be called a representative planning council. It is recommended that this approach be followed, with the explicit understanding that the "gatekeeper" is intended to open, not restrict, access. Other forms of publicizing the desire to recruit community parents and residents should simultaneously be employed.

The planning group should then draw plans for a formal policy-making structure which will be representative of the CAPTS model, with parents constituting 50 percent of the membership. Once the formal group is established, it should set up procedures for future changes, elections, etc.

II. Parity in Planning

If parents and other community members are to establish functional control over educational matters vital to their interest, they must be able to make choices on a fairly knowledgeable basis. They must also have organizational support, services and technical assistance. On the other side of the coin, professional school staff members are unlikely to reorganize or introduce new teaching strategies without some kind of formal opportunities to learn about them and to acquire the skills to implement them. That is, innovations cannot be generated simply by more money, more staff members, or louder demands for change.

Therefore, it is recommended that to qualify (beyond nomination) for site funding, each local school district be required to submit a plan to provide for:

1. A community education and organization program at each site.
2. A professional staff training and development program for staff members of each site.

The plan might well be developed in consultation with a local university capable of staying with and contributing to the program through all its phases. Plan development should be Federally funded. The community education component would provide parents and professionals with knowledge of educational alternatives and would expose them to new teaching strategies and some of the literature relevant to educational, institutional, and organizational change. The organizational component would establish

the necessary structures to carry out the community education program and would provide experience in the discussion and negotiation process.

Experience with previous change-oriented educational programs suggests that in terms of time and money, the planning periods were inadequate in proportion to the ambitions of the operational phase. Therefore, it is recommended that the planning period (of not less than three months and not more than one and a half years) provide for:

1. Selection of initial community participants through the gatekeeper method until the group is large enough to constitute a planning council to carry out the community organization and education program.
2. Implementation of the community organization and education program, including professional training and development.
3. Transition of the planning council into a formal structure.
4. Assessment of local needs under the direction of the formal council or community board.
5. Decision on specific program goals and objectives.
6. Translation of objectives into a new education plan for the school or site.
7. Reorganization of the professional staff, preferably along lateral rather than hierarchical lines, to carry out the plan.

With the completion of a formal needs assessment, development of a set of goals, and trans-

lation of these into a specific educational plan, the planning council will become the policy-making group for the site or school. Community members of this council should have the same rights regarding their site or school as central board members do regarding all the schools in their jurisdiction. Access to school records and budget information, requests for evaluation of particular programs, and access to the school generally, are among these basic rights.

Board members and all parents should have opportunities for informal evaluation and monitoring of school programs. The formal evaluation design for the project should be approved by the community board and should provide all members of the CAPTS model an opportunity to express their evaluation of the school. Board members should be sampled as a separate group.

IV. Other Essentials

1. Programs should be funded for five years.
2. Technical and developmental assistance should be available to the council in both the planning and operational phases. It should be of their choosing and it should be an obligation of the professional staff to inform these groups of its availability. Most observers believe that without technical assistance at every stage community participation programs will flounder.
3. The school should be open at all times to parents.
4. Professional staff members should seek parents and community members for employment in the program.
5. Parents and other community residents should

be reimbursed for expenses incurred in attending meetings (on a per diem basis).

6. Local school districts should be asked, where legally possible, to maintain separate administrative and housekeeping offices and staff for special projects. It is strongly felt by many observers that social and institutional change programs cannot survive—particularly those with community components—within the confines of a bureaucracy as "steep" as those of big city school systems. It is for this reason that local school autonomy is also recommended.
7. Communication is an extremely important factor at all stages of development. From the outset, every effort should be made to ensure a free flow of information to and from professionals and community residents alike. Market survey and other techniques using community members and parents as data-gatherers, should be employed to ascertain community ideas. Direct mail, leaflet handouts, speakers bureaus, store window posters, radio, TV and other forms of advertising may be used to disseminate information about the progress and needs of the project as they develop.
8. Every effort should be made to integrate planning for educational improvement with the efforts of other public service agencies in the community, (e.g., health care).

School Governance: Participation and Control by the Community

Community participation is usually defined as a means whereby a community of persons plays some active role in government of their own affairs for the purpose of assuring governance more responsive to their needs and wishes. But the community participation mechanisms do not, in terms of legal sanction, supplant the established governmental authority, which, for the schools, is the local board of education.

Community control, on the other hand, implies a different form of school government which replaces the established order. It involves a breakup of established power and responsibility and authority into new forms which replace the current ones. In the popular mind, community control is a political term—and it does not necessarily insure that community participation will occur, as evidenced by an analysis of New York City's School Decentralization Plan after almost a year of operation. "The intent of decentralization to enlist the community into the decision-making process is being neglected, if not controverted," reports a study prepared for the New York State Commission on the Quality, Cost, and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education by Marilyn Gittell and others.[4]

Semantic arguments are bound to occur concerning the two, but perhaps the important thing is to settle on some definitions which may assist in providing clarity. Community control is used here as a political term denoting formal change in the current political structures for public school governance. Community par-

ticipation is also used as a political term, but in a more limited sense which does not denote formal rearrangements of basic school governance units. To permit further distinctions, the terms "functional participation" and "functional control" are also used. Functional participation should simply be viewed as participation which accomplishes something; the form is irrelevant. Members of the press, for example, are often powerful functional participants (both publicly and privately) in governmental affairs, although no formal mechanisms attached to government exist for the purpose of their participation. Functional control should be viewed as participation which enables the participant to establish control, both perceived and real, over key matters defined by him on a knowledgeable basis as vital to his interests. Again, the form is irrelevant in the political sense.

Mario D. Fantini, a long-time activist on citizen participation and control fronts and now Dean of Education at the State University of New York at New Paltz, has suggested a plan which illumines the differentiation between community control and functional control. Fantini sees functional control as now the key issue—a concept which he says is "beyond community participation or control." He wishes to bring functional control to the level of the individual parent. To do this he suggests a plan which he calls "Public Schools of Choice."[5] It calls for the development of a variety of alternative models *within* large public school systems, including alternatives similar to that

now being developed *outside* the system by unhappy public school clients (the alternative or free school movement). He would then allow parents, children, and teachers and administrators to choose the alternative that they felt best suited them. The models would range from current, highly traditional ones to quite innovative ones, but each option would emphasize some, although not all, of a set of common educational objectives agreed upon as important for every member of an industrial society for survival. The models would feature differing degrees of participation in governance on the part of parents and others. In other words, choosing a public school would become much like choosing a college today. Having the choice would give the individual the parent functional control.

Robert J. Havighurst, of the University of Chicago, also provides an historical reason for distinguishing between community control as a political term and functional control.[6] He notes that community control was in fact the system of school governance which existed in big cities in the late 1800's and early 1900's. For example, in 1905 Philadelphia had 43 elected school boards consisting of 559 members (presumably all white), sharing with the central board of education the responsibility of hiring staff, building and maintaining schools, and other related functions. School systems were, in effect, governed by committees and subcommittees who concerned themselves, he reports, with ways of teaching reading, choice of textbooks, and examining prospective

teachers. But the literature of the day, according to Havighurst and others, is full of complaints about the dominance of schools by local politicians who regarded schools as part of the patronage system in awarding jobs and contracts as political favors. In other words, community control at that time did not assure that participation would occur in the sense that it is being sought today. Citizens did not exercise functional control; the idea that the poor or minorities should exercise any control was half a century away.

Early 20th century school reformers purposely attempted to remove school governors from situations in which they were subject to the pressures of the political system. Whether the schools have ever been truly depoliticized is questionable, but political theorists have concluded that their protected status enabled school boards and superintendents to present a solid and forbidding front to all but their most powerful political constituents.[7] It seems natural that those who have defined educational problems in strictly political terms would seek political solutions like community control.

However, a number of writers have challenged this view as overlooking a vital question: Control over what? It is their contention that shifting control over a bad system from one group to another does not necessarily change very much, particularly if the shift itself is the source of long and protracted controversy. Fantini puts it like this: "The key publics are blaming one another and losing track of the

real 'enemy'—the outdated nature of the institution we call school." He and others believe any new programs that look to the power issues and neglect the need for *institutional reform* of education will be doomed to failure. Fantini's writings and those of Morris Janowitz offer some definitive insights into the efficacy of this point of view and some of the current problems illustrating the need for institutional change.

Fantini and others have conceptualized current urban school problems as having to do with both supply and demand systems.[8] Community participation and control are demand-side interventions in that they provide new demand-side systems, but they *assume* the responsiveness of the market or the supply side. However, when the supply side is characterized by conditions of monopoly or limited competition, there is little likelihood of response to consumer desires. Since the public schools are virtually a monopoly, at least insofar as the poor are concerned, part of the urban school problem is, in this view, attributable to inelasticity of the supply system.

Medicaid is frequently offered as another example of a demand side only intervention which has produced little change in the health system. Although large numbers of consumers theoretically had the means to demand new service patterns, they actually had increased opportunity to purchase what exists—generally agreed to be inadequate in the first place. In fact, according to many observers, the existing stock of resources has been stretched thinner,

a few additional services have been provided, and the financial returns to existing suppliers (doctors and hospitals) have skyrocketed.[9]

In *Institution Building in Urban Education,* Morris Janowitz has analyzed the predominant response of the supply side of education to recent demand-side dissatisfactions in terms that will strike familiar notes for every big city board of education member and examiners of school programs generated by Federal funds. He calls the response the "specialization model" meaning that with each new task, new program, or new technique, new specialists and new specialized administrative procedures are added piecemeal to the old institutional structure or school system. This, complains another urban school critic, has caused the typical urban school "to become a conglomeration of strangers drawn to one place at best to stay out of the way of one another's inferred purposes."[10]

Janowitz further notes that the expansion of the specialization model is what he calls "capital intensive"— meaning that this expansion requires greater and greater amounts of money to pay for more highly trained personnel and more complex technological devices. Janowitz, noting that the specialization model has theoretical roots in certain current ideas about how children learn and individual psychology, points out that most Federally financed and local programs designed to reverse school failures are attempts to "rehabilitate the learner" to function within the specialization

model. What is needed, he contends, is rehabilitation of the system or model to fit the learner.

Janowitz proposes what he calls the "aggregation model," which would emphasize socialization of all those engaged in the educational enterprise, but not, he says, at the expense of academic goals. In the aggregation model, teaching strategies, administrative methods, and school organization are designed as much to foster an immediate social setting of individual dignity and self-respect as to reach specific academic achievement goals. An explanation of the model cannot be fully developed here, but Janowitz notes that its expansion would be "labor intensive" in contrast to "capital intensive." Labor intensive methods, he explains, are rooted in the notion that in the education process there is need for large amounts of inexpensive efforts and simply human resources. Janowitz contends that necessary socialization goals are not, cannot, and will not be realized by capital intensive techniques alone. This theory may help explain why, despite the doubling of most big city school budgets in the last ten years, urban schools continue to fail.

Janowitz's aggregation model is buttressed by some important studies of bureaucracies. For example, the literature suggests that rational bureaucracies may be divided into two types—those which are efficiency-oriented and those which are developmental.[11] Efficiency-oriented types are defined as those which focus on attainment of a predetermined output: e.g., a

company engaged in consumer goods production. Those which are developmental have as their preeminent goal the management of some kind of change or development. School systems are clearly of the latter type since their major goal is to manage the change of the uneducated into the educated.

Students of the subject have concluded that socialization of clients into new roles is of paramount importance for developmental bureaucracies. Satisfaction of efficiency criteria and achievement of output goals are impossible as long as they are unable to work effectively with their clients (certainly the situation that big city schools are in). In assigning institutional roles, such organizations must place major emphasis on gaining the cooperation of their clients rather than using traditional efficiency criteria (such as achievement scores in this case) to delineate institutional assignments.[12] Janowitz would surely argue that the latter is exactly what the specialization model does, while his aggregation model would do the former.

Janowitz's proposal provides a linkage between the supply and the demand sides of the educational enterprise and changes in both. In his model, reform on the demand side is inherent in what is proposed for reform on the supply side. One would not—or probably could not—omit functional participation and control on the part of parents and community residents from any attempt to socialize all school participants into new cooperative roles.

The model would seem to assume participatory parity for each group; that is, people from each group would have opportunities to stand up and say, "This does not seem to be working, let's change it." Each group member would need the reasonable assurance that, depending upon the merits of his arguments, change might take place. As one urban educator noted, "People get excited about solving problems in their world. They do not get excited about giving advice to people they do not believe are listening."[13] There are several studies indicating that achievement of all types is founded upon confidence in one's own ability to change the world (self-esteem or sense of control over one's environment).[14] Reform considerations must respect this need on the part of all concerned parties.

A Typology of Models of Community Participation

Inadequate conceptualization of community participation on the part of most school administrators is responsible for much of the controversy surrounding it. Community participation, and certainly any degree of community control, is viewed in terms of what may be called the *Bare Bones Power Model.* In this model, some measure of decision-making power shifts from the central school board and administrative office to some segment of the community: virtually nothing else changes. Under existing codes and statutes in many states, such transfers of power are, in fact, illegal. Those with experience in community participation matters are opposed to community control in this "bare" form because they consider it dysfunctional for all concerned.

However, the failure of school officials to develop ideas about community and parental roles much beyond the simple power issues, coupled with the growing general dissatisfaction and noise level concerning schools, has led to the development of what might be called *The Placation Model.* The term is borrowed from a typology developed by Sherry R. Arnstein, former Chief Advisor on Citizen Participation in HUD's Model Cities Administration.[15] Although she defined the model in slightly different terms, as defined here, the concept means that school officials and school boards allow community persons and parents to play whatever minimum roles and make whatever minimum decisions necessary to keep the noise level down. The "noise" may be generated from various sources—the Federal govern-

ment, state level agencies, some local board members, or community persons themselves (some of whom may be for, and others who may be against, larger community roles for certain community segments). *The Placation Model* has been the major response of school systems nationwide to Federal mandates for community participation in various Federally financed education programs.

Some big city systems are beginning to work their way beyond the Placation Model, but most are not. It should be noted that a common misconception—particularly among legislators and politicians—is that big cities have been the worst offenders in this regard. This is not the case if one looks at instances of violations rather than dollar values of programs. This is particularly well documented in the case of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, in numerous official studies as well as unofficial ones by members of the press and others.[16]

Most analysts have attributed the "placation" response to the reluctance of school administrators to let go of any of their power. Yet, administrators often seem to be as trapped in the Placation Model as their ill-fated school clients. Hedged about by all sorts of problems including the growing complexity of Federal guidelines, Federal requirements which are unsaleable and unexplainable in their complexity to the community, unreasonable deadlines, the opposition of some conservative-minded boards to community direction power shifts, and so

on, what seems to have occurred is goal displacement. In this chaotic no-win ball game, many school officials have shifted from their primary goal of educating children to personal survival. School personnel, from teachers to high-level administrators, with whom the writer has talked (see interview list following bibliography) express the feeling that what they are doing with regard to community participation is to survive rather than anything resembling bettering the education of children. They are particularly concerned about decisions based on placation of highly vocal but unrepresentative segments of communities. One said, for example, "We are making multi-million dollar decisions—that I could not possibly justify rationally—on the basis of demands from a few, highly vocal people in various sections of the city, whom I suspect in a few years may just disappear. What am I going to say when somebody comes in and wants a responsible explanation of why we did it this way?"

A "responsible explanation" is, of course, exactly what must be demanded of responsible administrators, and this kind of candor should not divert the public from seeing that one is given. The Placation Model cannot possibly serve as a basis for school reform. It increases hostility between all the players in the school drama, and it is dysfunctional for all concerned. Within any viable replacement scheme, all participants should believe what they are doing is for the betterment of the educational process for children.

There are, of course, some alternative models which may prove more appropriate. A brief description in terms of the major functions of participation follows:

(1) The Sanctions Model – The major purpose is to find persons, preferably highly visible to the widest community, who will give sanction to already established or newly developed school goals.

(2) The Informational Model – The major purpose is to bring together a group of persons who who have information which school officials have decided they need or which they have been directed to obtain by, e.g., the Federal government or their own board.

(3) The Checks and Balances Model – The major purpose of this model is to provide citizens or some segment of them with some inquiry, veto and "checkmate" powers, which they may use to prevent being hornswoggled or ridden rough-shod over. The model necessitates a two-way exchange of information between citizens and school officials, and citizens must approve or disapprove certain decisions regarding programs they have been gathered together to protect and foster in their own interest.

(4) The Change-Agent Model – This model, when functional, is vastly more complex than any of the other three, and is capable of appearing in limitless substantiative forms. Its major purpose is to set in motion a series of events that will assure that the group, as individuals and as a collective, and the substance with which they are dealing, will change over a period of time. The changes must be goal-oriented in terms developed by the participants. Community organ-

ization is an essential ingredient of this model, and it must also subsume most of the elements of the Informational Model and the Checks and Balances Model. In this model citizens have what might be called "negative power" (to prevent things) but they also have "forward motion power" through the new roles they develop. The latter is the chief source of functional control in this model.

Obviously in the real world of people and programs, combinations of all these models will occur. Seldom will one find "pure" examples, but some of the essential elements of each can be seen more closely in recent local and Federal programs.

In The Sanctions Model, the choice of citizens who will participate is left solely to the judgments of school officials or board members. The participants are selected to serve various predetermined ends, in general to spread the word of approval concerning goals which remain largely shaped by school officials themselves. Those tapped to serve usually have great prestige in some wide community, are influential with other opinion leaders, or have influence upon some special audiences which the schools might not ordinarily reach or particularly need support from.

Appropriate situational contexts for use of this model would be the start of a school bond referendum campaign, the beginning of a legislative session when passage of important school legislation is desired, or the launching of some

new, area-wide program (such as integration) which will need widespread support for success.

An example would be the Friends of the Schools Committee attached to the Board of Education in Chicago. The committee's principal function is to examine financial needs data developed by school officials and to lobby for school appropriations by the State Legislature. Surely the Blue Ribbon Committee practices of the nation's mayors, governors, presidents, and lesser officials need no further elaboration.

The Informational Model appears in both simple and more complex forms. In the simplest form, school officials maintain control over the choice of persons who will participate without reference to any framework other than their own desires. An example would be a committee of citizens and/or educators brought together by a school board when they are beginning a search for a new superintendent. Such groups usually draw up criteria and a list of names from which the new man or woman may be drawn.

When programs are involved, the school officials must locate and bring together persons whom the programs are designed to serve. It is assumed that the participants have information (which the school officials lack in some measure) about what needs those programs should be designed to meet, services those programs should offer, and what features should be avoided. The citizens assembled or contacted are to tell school officials what they want and

need. School officials then use their professional expertise to develop, implement, and evaluate the programs, while the further participation of the citizens is essentially restricted to providing feedback. School officials face a variety of problems in making this model functional, including how to assure broad representation of participants and how to arrange to get the information from them. School officials are usually free to ignore the information they get, but if the model is functional they will not. Follow-through will occur at least until the programs are operative, and new information may be solicited to assist in program modification.

An interesting functional example of this model was initiated in Chicago a few years ago when the superintendent assigned an aide to assess the needs of the Spanish-speaking for specialized classroom instructional materials and other services. This was to be done on an ad hoc basis outside the regular school channels (such as Curriculum Department specialists who would normally handle such assignments). Pockets of Spanish-speaking residents—including Mexicans, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans—were located, using demographic data. Principals in the areas were directed to arrange a series of small meetings in each school to solicit the ideas of parents and community residents, and to have Spanish-speaking teachers available for translation and note-taking. Each school then sent lists of desired materials and services to central office where they were subjected to item analysis and consolidated. Later, three open meetings were held at central office to al-

low organizations from the same areas or city-wide groups to present their ideas. During the summer, a group of professionals (still for the most part from outside the Curriculum Department) and community participants drawn from the school level were assembled and paid to handmake sets of materials based on the consolidated lists from the schools and organizations. When this was completed, a smaller group of professionals organized them into 14 packages of program descriptions and bilingual materials for duplication. These sets were sent to the schools and are now in use. The program was little publicized and never duplicated, although it was the first instance in Chicago of functional citizen control over instructional materials and curriculum-making on any organized, widespread basis.

The community components of most Federal programs started as informational models and most have remained in this form, although the number and types of informational roles have been steadily expanded. The informational model allows advisory councils and other groups to establish some degree of functional control over programs, particularly via the follow-through roles, such as monitoring operation, evaluation, and suggesting program modifications for the following year. However, for this to occur, the councils need to be furnished with technical assistance.

The regulations for Title I of ESEA furnish an example of a community component mandate that seems to envision the Informational

Model. The Title I regulations state that parent councils must be involved in the planning, development, operation, and evaluation of local Title I projects, but the "informational" nature of their role is emphasized, as can be seen from the following excerpts from the Title I guidelines. Parent councils are to be formed in order to:

> Make recommendations concerning the needs of the target population and how these needs can be met through Title I and other programs. Submit comments, if desired, to local school personnel and the State Education Agency about the local Title I application.
>
> Review evaluations of past and present Title I programs.

In the Checks and Balances Model, parents and community residents are given veto and inquiry powers in one or more of the areas in which, under the Informational Model, they are only advisors.

The best example from among Federally funded education programs seems to be Head Start, which began in the Office of Economic Opportunity, but was shifted to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The 1967 Head Start policy manual speaks of Policy Advisory Groups of which "50 percent must be parents of participating children." (The 1970 policy manual changes their title to "Policy Committees or Councils.") In addition to 50 percent parents, the councils must include representatives of the community. The 1967 regulations

in enumerating the functions of the Policy Advisory Groups stated that, as a minimum, they should participate in the selection of the program director and "have a voice in establishing criteria for the selection of staff personnel." Under the 1970 manual, however, they "must approve or disapprove" the hiring and firing of the director and staff, and any major changes in budget or work program while the program is in operation. Technical assistance is mandated and so is reimbursement for expenses incurred because of meetings. Parents must be sought for employment in the local programs. Furthermore, the manual states directly that "Head Start classes must be open to parents at times reasonable and convenient to them. There are very few occasions when the presence of a limited number of parents would present any problem in the operation of the program."

Head Start has some potential for becoming a Change-Agent program and in some locales, it has been. However, such instances—at least those which have found their way into the literature—are almost invariably ones in which local school systems are not the operating agency.[17] Few Federally funded programs qualify for classification under the *Change-Agent Model.*

The Career Opportunities Program, funded under the Education Professions Development Act of 1967, is one Federal education program in which the Federal guidelines themselves clearly embrace the concept of the Change-

Agent Model. The program offers teacher aides in schools in low-income areas tuition-free college study to qualify them for teaching careers. The guidelines state: "The Career Opportunities Program should be viewed as a program encompassing the concept of planned social and institutional change." Furthermore, the guidelines say that community representation "should particularly take into account roles for parents and for students, as well as for community members who are key residents of the neighborhoods of the schools served." It is further mandated that the concept of a partnership between schools, college and community participating in the program "characterize the entire developmental process" of the program. The collaborative process " must begin promptly, continue throughout the entire developmental process, and the implementation stage of the program."

The key words for understanding the Change-Agent Model are "social system and institutional" change. That is its major purpose. The changes must be goal-oriented in terms developed and agreed upon by those on both sides of the institutional fence—clients and school personnel. Some examples might include the Woodlawn Experimental Schools Projects in Chicago; the Experimental Districts in New York City (one of which was the nationally known Ocean Hill-Brownsville), Martin Luther King School in Syracuse, New York; the Anacostia project in southeast Washington, D.C.; the Federation of Community Schools in Milwaukee; the Triple T

Program (Training Teachers of Teachers) in Chicago Districts 24 and 25 with Northwestern University; and the Springfield Avenue Community School in Newark, New Jersey.

Some Change-Agent Model projects have been more successful than others. Most do not endure for a variety of reasons: They become too controversial; funding is cut off; evaluation is inadequate; achievement results do not roll in fast enough; community organizational support disintegrates; and so on. Some are simply ill-conceived. By and large, there is a dearth of improved school achievement data from them, although there are some notable exceptions to this. Many writers believe that most such experiments have not been carried out long enough under stable conditions (usually agreed upon as necessarily about five years) for this to occur.[18]

Key elements common to the most promising experiments involving community participation appear to include the following:

1. A rather lengthy "gestation period" (at least three months, sometimes one and a half years) before changes "really get off the ground." The period is characterized by struggles of various sorts during which a great deal of community organization and school reorganization takes place.
2. School reorganization is characterized by movement to lateral rather than hierarchical assignment of roles.
3. New mechanisms for direct and indirect com-

munication between all those concerned with the school—parents, teachers, and so on. Special training sessions and technical assistance are needed to accomplish this.

4. Classes are open to all parents for visits at any time.
5. Usually, but not invariably, parents have some form of functional control over school policy, through majority membership on a policy group which has the final authority for making decisions on school goals and objectives. However, the professionals are viewed as having the skills to translate parental and community interest into educational terms and procedures.
6. Most councils have some kind of control or veto over hiring and firing and budget decisions.
7. Technical assistance is available both to parents and professionals and training or retraining of both is emphasized in some way.
8. Participants are usually reimbursed for expenses of attending meetings.
9. Parents and community members are employed in the program.
10. No set pattern of membership for the policy-making councils. They are about evenly divided between all parents and variations on the CAPTS model (Community, Administrators, Parents, Teachers, and Students).
11. The structure and membership of the policy-making body and other participatory mechanisms are usually decided upon by the parents and/or others after the initial planning and struggle period. After the initial structure and membership are determined (though sometimes before), election procedures for future changes

are set up.

12. The chief administrator is usually something of a maverick type, at least in his views of traditional school organization, policies, and procedures. He is primarily interested in getting things done in contrast to "we never did it that way before" attitudes.
13. There is no set pattern for initial selection of members of the early participation mechanism, although it usually is restricted to parents of children and/or residents of the school attendance area or areas. One favored method is known as the gatekeeper approach: a few activist parents and/or community members are selected to recruit others until there are succeeding layers of involvement in what might be termed a planning council. At some point, this group settles on some formal structure and procedures. (Northwestern began its Triple T program by actually hiring two community gatekeepers to recruit others.)

The Unresolved Question: Participation vs. Control

Functional participation and control can be established over vital school issues within a framework of community participation. It is not likely to be within the purview of the Federal government to settle the community control issue through program guidelines or otherwise, although some writers continue to see this issue as crucial to the efficacy of any project. Some continue to argue that a prerequisite to success is the *formal* transfer of power and authority outward from central boards and administrative offices in some political or semi-political fashion, perhaps in the form of delegated powers. Advocates of this view see this transfer as a necessary phase before functional control can be established.[19]

Others, like Fantini, have begun to argue that what is now needed is some kind of reform which avoids or at least ameliorates "the group power game in which we are presently engaged."

Havighurst continues to be one of the cogent arguers against community control.[20] He believes that community control tends to be destructive for two major reasons: First, the controversy over the break-up of power distracts people from educational issues and obviates against a framework or floor of stability necessary for school changes to occur and grow. There is some evidence of this from the Gittell evaluation of New York's three experimental districts, particularly Ocean Hill-Brownsville. The evaluators found that community board members did not have enough

time for educational matters because of excessive time spent on "immediate crises" which were essentially power crises. The evaluators found the administrators had similar problems. They grasped the need to restructure the system politically and to work beneficially with parents—but were "unable to coordinate their energies into a strong educational master plan."

Nevertheless, Gittell apparently would argue that these problems represent a stage, a necessary one, which allows greater focus on educational change than would be possible without its occurrence. There is evidence that power questions must be dealt with at an early stage, even within a framework of community participation, but they may be less acerbating. For example, William Hazard of Northwestern University's Triple T Program (Training Teachers of Teachers)—which has a community board composed of more than 50 percent parents and community residents—reports that project participants spent "a lot of the first year and a half going into power questions." He adds his belief that "there was no optimal way that power issues could be telescoped if we were serious about including only relatively sophisticated community people."

But Havighurst has a second objection to community control. He believes that breakup of central board power allows the subversion of overall social and educational goals through the development of small enclaves of existing economic, political, and racial interests. These interests can consolidate their power in various

parts of the city, he argues, and no longer are required to cooperate within a larger system "toward a democratic solution of the problems of the big city." Integration would be an example of a goal which would move further away from achievement under community control, in Havighurst's view. While he agrees that individual schools should have substantially more autonomy than at present, he argues that current models are unsatisfactory, "Achieving a constructive alliance between localized power and decision-making and area-wide power and decision-making is the main task of educators in the large cities and metropolitan areas during the 1970's." Havighurst would almost certainly argue that a new national program should avoid entanglements in power issues to the extent possible.

Conclusion

In the course of this survey, several areas in which further research and development efforts are needed have been identified.[21] They include:

–Development of new communications models which would be useful for schools.

–Interdisciplinary consolidation of research findings relevant to the solution of school problems, including questions related to community participation.

–Improved methods for evaluation of school programs that will be qualitative and process-oriented. This seems particularly vital if community participation issues are to be settled on the basis of research findings.

However, interviews with persons knowledgeable about specific Change-Agent Models (and about community participation in general), as well as a survey of the existing literature, reveal basic agreement on many points.

–There is absolutely no panacea model, and no national model should be imposed.

–While parental functional control and community parity is highly regarded as vital to the efficacy of any model, and the Change-Agent Model in particular, no one can describe its parameters in precise terms or define it in numerical or structural terms. It cannot be superimposed on a project through guidelines, although they may set the stage for it. It must "evolve" in ways and take forms that will and must vary from place to place.

–There should be community and school field unit participation in drawing up any national guidelines for school programs–else functional participation is already circumscribed and may

be precluded.

—There should be a lengthy planning period during which time parents, community members, and school-level administrators should have access to technical assistance of their choosing. Knowledge of alternatives, community organizational mechanisms, and school reorganization along lateral lines are essential ingredients of a successful project.

—New vehicles and techniques should be developed for determining levels of community information and approval, perhaps borrowing from the field of opinion sampling and market analysis. However, community residents, parents, and local school personnel should be built into any plan as the survey-takers.[22] Perhaps this could be along the lines of the Information Return for Schools System Model currently in use in the schools of Oakland County, Michigan.[23] Strengthened communications of all types between all participants is another essential ingredient of programs intended to produce functional control by parents, and social and institutional change generally.

—If at all possible, funding should not be on a competitive basis, since this mitigates against functional community participation as local school agencies rush to meet competitive deadlines.

—A teacher training or retraining component, preferably university based, should be a part of any program. It would be desirable to include potential or selected administrators in this component also.

—Outstanding administrative leadership may be

the most important variable in successful reform.[24] Studies have shown that successful inner-city schools almost always have administrators who refuse to engage in meaningless, wheel-spinning, bureaucratic games.[25] Another study suggests that situations which are "highly problematic" for an organization create a need for administrators who can give relatively "structured" leadership.[26] It is important to note the distinction between freedom to provide the structure and imposition of a structure from above. Still a third study suggests that traditional school administrators prefer to have structure and rules provided for them; they seek to escape from "uncertainty from above."[27] What does this all add up to? Probably about the best the local school district, or perhaps national guidelines, can do is try to make clear in some fashion that the program contemplated will be a "play-it-by-ear" affair in which the rules will not all be spelled out ahead of time.

—Improved evaluation methods and procedures should be provided for in any project beginning with the initiation of the planning period. A documentary evaluative history of the project from the beginning will be an important aspect of this. Any program built on the Change-Agent Model will be a social action and institutional change program. Evaluation must, therefore, be qualitative and process-oriented. The Institute for Community Studies of Queens College seems to have been successful with a participant-observer approach. The various procedures used by the Institute should be disseminated and studied for future modeling.

—To be successful and functional, community participation must interlock with all other aspects of the program, and other facets of the program must be geared to functional participation by parents. Otherwise, the community participation component will either adjust to or collide with the school from the beginning. Such a course seriously mitigates against efficacy.

The schools in a free society must provide options, if they are to be genuinely free themselves: options not only for individual students, but for the communities of which they are a part. The people in each community should have the opportunity to help decide what is important, what is relevant, in the education of their children. It is time to move beyond the rhetoric of community participation to its realization, by building into new educational programs the institutional arrangements whereby citizens, parents and others, can have a genuine voice in school affairs.

The Recruitment Leadership and Training Institute urges the U.S. Office of Education to take the lead in giving a position of parity to the community in educational plans and programs. Community parity may not be easy to institute; it may not even succeed, in the views of some. It will certainly not guarantee success for a specific educational program. But while rigid adherence to traditional patterns of planning and policy-making may well be to court disaster, community parity in Federally funded programs is an important means of restoring integrity to American education.

Footnotes

1. Henry M. Levin, *The Costs to the Nation of Inadequate Education,* A Report Prepared for the Senate Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972).
2. Derrick A. Bell, Jr., "Integration – Is It a No-Win Education Policy for Blacks?," unpublished paper prepared for the National Policy Conference on Education for Blacks, 1972, 18.
3. The "gatekeeper" term originally appeared in reference to formal or "establishment" structures but has worked its way into usage in discussing less formal organization and processes. For an explanation of the formal idea, see A.K. Gaynor, "Some Implications of Political Systems Theory for Alternative Demand Processing Mechanisms for Public School Systems," *Educational Administrative Quarterly,* Winter 1971, 34-35.
4. Marilyn Gittell and others, *School Decentralization and School Policy in New York City . . .* (New York: Institute for Community Studies, 1971).
5. Mario D. Fantini, "Educational Agenda for the 1970's and Beyond: Public Schools of Choice, *Social Policy,* November-December, 1970, 25.
6. Robert J. Havighurst, "The Reorganization of Education in Metropolitan Areas," *Phi Delta Kappan,* February 1971, 354.
7. For one example of development of this reasoning, see A.K. Gaynor, "Some Implications of Political Systems Theory for Alternative Demand Processing Mechanisms for Public School Systems," *Educational Administrative Quarterly,* Winter 1971, 34-35.
8. For a brief summary of this view, see Alan Gartner's Introduction to Fantini's "Educational Agenda for the 1970's and Beyond: Public Schools of Choice," *Social Policy,* November-December 1970, 24.
9. Ibid.
10. William W. Wayson, "Organizing Urban Schools for Responsible Education," *Phi Delta Kappan,* February 1971, 344.

11. See, for example, Berton H. Kaplan, "Notes on a Non-Weberian Model of Bureaucracy: The Case of Development Bureaucracy," *Administrative Science Quarterly,* December 1968, 471-83.
12. For a brief summary of these concepts from the literature, see Daniel U. Levine, "Concepts of Bureaucracy in Urban School Reform," *Phi Delta Kappan,* February 1971, 328.
13. William Wayson, "Organizing Urban Schools for Responsible Education," *Phi Delta Kappan,* February 1971, 344.
14. This is a generally accepted premise among psychologists and social researchers and writers of all types. One finds it in folk stories told to children ("The Little Engine Who Could") and serious works. It was an idea used in developing the line of reasoning for the Brown vs. the Board of Education decision in May 1954. More recently one finds it in the Coleman Equality of Educational Opportunity Study. For a brief discussion of the Coleman findings as related to black children in particular and related supportive data, see Marilyn Gittell's "Student Attitudes," in *Demonstration for Social Change,* 117.
15. Sherry Arnstein, "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," *American Institute of Planners Journal,* July 1969, 216 ff.
16. See, for example, the reports of the National Advisory Council on Title I; the various HEW and GAO Audit reports on Title I; Special Issue, "Title I and parent participation in education, in *Equality in Education,* November 13, 1971, and the New York Times *Index.*
17. For example, the Mississippi Institute for Early Childhood Education, an extension of Mary Holmes Junior College.
18. Marilyn Gittell in *Demonstration for Change,* 1970.
19. Gittell and others.
20. Robert J. Havighurst, "The Reorganization of Education in Metropolitan Areas," *Phi Delta Kappan,*

February 1971, 354.
21. Persons interested in evaluation problems should study the variety of articles on this topic in the *Journal of Educational Measurement* – and are particularly referred to the writings of Stufflebeam and Gephardt.
22. Bernard C. Watson, "Rebuilding the System: Practical Goal or Impossible Dream?," *Phi Delta Kappan,* February 1971, 349.
23. Nancy Stark, "How Schools Can Listen to the Community," *American Education,* July 1971, 8-10.
24. Daniel U. Levine, "Concepts of Bureaucracy in Urban School Reform," *Phi Delta Kappan,* February 1971, 329.
25. Russell C. Doll, *Variations Among Inner-City Elementary Schools,* (Kansas City, Mo.: Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education, 1969).
26. Fred A. Fiedler, "A Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness," L. Berkowitz, ed.; *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology,* Vol. 1., (New York: Academic Press, 1964).
27. *Elementary Principals and Their Schools: Beacons of Brilliance and Potholes of Pestilence* (Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon).

Bibliography

Note:
Research in the literature of community participation is complicated by the fact that this topic cuts across so many different disciplines: sociology, psychology, political science, education, urbanology, city planning, and so on. While the insights provided from these various perspectives are all helpful, further work remains to be done in integrating them into a coherent picture of what exists and comprehensive guidelines for future development.
The following list of books, reports and articles is comprised of a representative selection of material currently available.

Books

Altshuler, Alan A.
1970 *Community Control: The Black Demand for Participation in Large American Cities,* New York. Pegasus.

Berkowitz, L., ed.
1960 *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology,* vol. 1, New York. Academic Press.

Clark, Terry N., ed.
1968 *Community Structure and Decision-Making: A Comparative Analysis.* Chandler Publishing Company.

Janowitz, Morris
1969 *Institution Building in Urban Education,* New York. Russell Sage Foundation.

Levin, Henry, ed.
1970 *Community Control of Schools,* Washington, D.C. The Brookings Institutions.

Sheldon, Marcus and Harry N. Rivlin, ed.
1970 *Conflicts in Urban Education,* New York. Basic Books.

Studies, Surveys, Etc.

Cunningham, Luvern L. and others
1969 *Citizen Participation in School Affairs: A Report to the Urban Coalition,* Washington, D.C.

Doll, Russell C.
1969 *Variations Among Inner-City Elementary Schools,* Kansas City, Mo. Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education.

Gittell, Marilyn, and others
1971 *Demonstration for Social Change: An Experiment in Local Control,* Institute for Community Studies, Queens College of the City University of New York. (An evaluation of the three experimental districts established in 1967 in New York City; Ocean Hill-Brownsville, I.S. - 201, Two Bridges.

Gittell, Marilyn, and others
1971 *School Decentralization and School Policy in New York City — A Report for the New York State Commission on the Quality, Cost, and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education,* Institute for Community Studies, Queens College of the City University of New York.

Spiegel, Hans B.C.
1971 "Citizen Participation in Federal Programs: A Review," *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, Monograph No. 1.*
1971 *Elementary Principals and Their Schools: Beacons of Brilliance and Potholes of Pestilence,* Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

Spiegel, Hans B.C., editor
1969 *Citizen Participation in Urban Development*
Volume I: Concepts and Issues
Volume II: Cases and Programs

Washington, D.C. National Institute for Applied Behavioral Sciences.

Articles in Periodicals, Scholarly and Professional Journals

Ardes, John
Winter 1971 "Alternative Models for Urban School District Organization," *Educational Administrative Quarterly,* 7:64-86.

Arnstein, Sherry R.
July 1969 "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," *American Institute of Planners Journal,* XXV, 216-24.

Datta, Lois-Ellin
September 1970 "Headstart's Influence on Community Change," *Children,* 17:193-6.

Derr, Richard L.
October 1970 "Meeting Community Demands for Decentralization of Control," *School and Society,* 98: 362-3.

Fantini, Mario D.
March 1971 "Public Schools of Choice and the Plurality of Publics," *Educational Leadership,* 5:85-91.

Fantini, Mario D.
January 1971 "Public Schools of Choice," *The PTA Magazine,* 1-4.

Fantini, Mario D.
November-December 1970 "Educational Agenda for the 1970's and Beyond: Public Schools of Choice," *Social Policy,* 25.

Gartner, Alan
November-December 1970 Introduction to "Educational Agenda for the 1970's and Beyond: Public Schools of Choice," *Social Policy,* 24.

Gaynor, A.K.
Winter 1971 "Some Implications of Political Systems Theory for Alternative Demand Processing Mechanisms for Public School Systems," *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 34-35.

Hearn, Norman E.
February 1972 "The Where, When, How of Trying Innovation," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 3-8, 361-74.

Herman, B.E.
March 1971 "Community Involvement: A Positive Approach in Education; Winchester Community School, New Haven, Connecticut," *Integrated Education*, 9: 28-30.

Herman, B.E.
January 1971 "Community School -- New Thrust in Education," *Educational Leadership*, 419-23.

Holton, Clara K.
November 1971 "Challenge of Change," *Educational Leadership*, 29: 136-8.

Janowitz, Morris
December 1970 "People-Changing Institutions," in *Teachers College Record*, 249.

Kaplan, Berton H.
December 1968 "Notes on a Non-Weberian Model of Bureaucracy: The Case of Development Bureaucracy," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 471-83.

Levine, Daniel U., ed.
February 1971 "The Reform of Urban Education," a Special Issue of *Phi Delta Kappan*, (Entire issue -- 15 articles) 328.

Litwak, Eugene and Henry J. Meyer

June 1966 "A Balance Theory of Coordination between Bureaucratic Organizations and Community Primary Groups," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31-58.

Mecklenburger, James A.
February 1972 "Merely Journalism as Educational Research," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 382.

Orlosky, Donald and B. Othanel Smith
March 1972 "Educational Change: Its Origins and Characteristics," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 412-14.

Stark, Nancy
July 1971 "How Schools Can Listen to the Community," *American Education*, 7:8-10.

Wray, Jessie E.
November 1970 "Alternative Systems of Education: Milwaukee's Federation of Independent Community Schools," *Integrated Education*, 8:39-44.

Spring 1968 "The Short Happy Life of the Adams-Morgan Community School," *Harvard Educational Review*, 235-62.

December 1971 "Newark's Parent-Powered School," *American Education*, 35.

November 13, 1971 No. 6 "Power to the People through Title I? – Maybe," *Inequality in Education*. (Special Issue)

Special thanks for sharing their views on community participation go to the following persons who were interviewed by telephone or in person by Hope Justus, a free-lance writer engaged by the Recruitment LTI to assist in preparation of this position paper.

Arnstein, Sherry R., former Chief Advisor on Citizen Participation in HUD's Model Cities Administration, now a Washington-based Urban Affairs Consultant, by phone.

Fantini, Mario D., former program officer for the Ford Foundation, now Dean of Education at the State University of New York College at New Paltz.

Florio, David, Northwestern University doctoral candidate in the School of Education and a Triple T Fellow.

Gittell, Marilyn, Director of the Institute for Community Studies, Queens College, City University of New York.

Haskins, Ken, former principal, Adams-Morgan Community School, Washington, D.C., now at Harvard University, Triple T Program, New York, by phone.

Havighurst, Robert J., Professor of Education, University of Chicago.

Hazard, William, Professor of Education, Northwestern University, and Director, Northwestern's Triple T Program.

Sizemore, Mrs. Barbara, former Director, Woodlawn Experimental Schools Project in Chicago, now Coordinator Proposal Development, Department of Government-Funded Programs, Chicago Public Schools.

Five other school officials in large city school systems were interviewed but requested anonymity. Their positions ranged from superintendent to local school principal.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1972 701-093/31 - 55